



webserver@yucca-web.ymp.gov on 01/09/2008 09:07:39 PM

RRR000868

To: EIS_Comments@ymp.gov
cc:
Subject: EIS Comment

User Filed as: Not Categorized in ERMS

January 09, 2008 21:07:39

IP address: 69.29.70.73

The Commentors Name:

---> Mr. Steven Starr MT

The Commentors Address:

---> 604 West Blvd. South

---> Columbia, Missouri 65203

Email Information:

---> starr@isp01.net

---> Add commentor to the mailing list : yes

Contact Information:

---> fax number : 573 256 1067

---> phone number : 573 256 1808

---> organization :

---> position :

Comment Text :

--> Dear EIS Office (DOE, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management),

15 I would like to make a couple comments upon the current/proposed plans for radioactive waste disposal at Yucca Mountain.

First, I want to say that I support the idea that the high-level waste which is now stored on site all across the U.S. should be dealt with and not left as is. Clearly this is a situation which needs to be addressed in a timely fashion, given the lethal and long-lived nature of the environmental poisons involved.

However, I do not agree with the current plans to ship waste across the U.S., particularly on Interstate highways which are already extremely overcrowded and routinely experiencing significant traffic accidents on a regular basis. Sure, the containers will be difficult to breach . . . but there is no way to be sure it can't happen. And you cannot rule out the possibility that there will be deliberate attempts to bring about this type of tragic accident through terrorist actions.

Although the on-site storage presents a target of opportunity for terrorists, it will be much easier to guard the waste on the current sites than attempt to protect tens of thousands of radioactive shipments as they wind their way across the entire U.S.

I also think there are several reasons why Yucca mountain is not a good solution for long-term waste storage. Because it is a salt formation (why not use granite?), if any water ever seeps into it, it will create a brine solution which will quickly erode the containers holding the waste. There also is new geological evidence that Yucca mountain is near to a fault-line, which could someday result in an earthquake in the vicinity, which would have unpredictable results. Remember, we are talking about storage for time periods many times longer than the entire time our country has existed . . .

Given the questions about the geological integrity and suitability of the site, along with the dangers posed by transporting large amounts of high-level radioactive waste across the entire U.S., it seems only prudent to consider other alternatives. The best alternative, I believe, is on-site storage . . . after the waste has been stabilized, and all liquids have been converted into a form, such as glass logs, which will prevent it from easily entering the ecosystems in liquid form. This type of conversion and storage will provide a viable short-term solution while a better long-term solution can be devised.

Thank you for your time and consideration.]
